

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/432,087	MISAWA, TAKESHI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anatoly Vortman	2835	

All Participants:
Status of Application: rejected

 (1) Primary Examiner Anatoly Vortman / AU 2835.

 (3) Michael K. Mutter, Reg. No. 29,680.

 (2) Catherine M. Voisinnet, reg. No. 52,327.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: see cont. sheet
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

yes

Claims discussed:

1, 13-17, and 31

Prior art documents discussed:

US/6417884, 5440449, 5768163, 6118653, 6081422, 6049880, 5801919, 6151206, 5708853, 5587876, 5808672, 6049450, and 5880928


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The Examiner had conducted several telephone discussions with Ms. Catherine M. Voisinnet between April 26 and May 9, 2005 in an attempt to place the application in condition for allowance.

Specifically, the arguments presented by Applicant regarding 37 C.F.R. 1.131 Declaration and regarding the Scheer ('449) reference have been discussed. The Examiner has also presented the Applicant's representative with additional references, which would anticipate claim 31 and has requested to cancel the claim. On May 9, 2005 Ms. Catherine M. Voisinnet has approved the cancellation of claim 31.

On May 12, 2005 the Examiner has telephoned Ms. Catherine M. Voisinnet and indicated that in light of the recent discussions with SPRE Mr. Hien Phan and SPE Ms. Lynn Field, the aforementioned 37 C.F.R. 1.131 Declaration is insufficient to antedate the US/6,417,884 to Chang et al. patent. Hence, the Examiner has suggested to amend pending independent claims in order to claim around the Chang ('884). No agreement was reached.

Further, during telephone communication with Ms. Catherine M. Voisinnet and Mr. Michael K. Mutter on May 12, 2005, the Examiner has explained the situation and has advised the Applicant's representatives that, since the prosecution of the application is under Supervisory Review, the final decision regarding the 37 C.F.R. 1.131 Declaration will be made by Supervisory Patent Examiner Ms. Lynn Field.



Anatoly Vortman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 2835